REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims are believed to be clearly supported by the specification; specifically, original claims such as claim 15.

The independent claims 1, 32, 49, and 54 have been amended to provide that the graphics, images, motion pictures, or the video clips relating to an entertainer or celebrity are randomly selected for play.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the examiner acknowledges that Walker et al. 6,234,896 "...is silent regarding an explicit teaching of randomly selecting a video clip from a plurality of video clips in a chance machine."

It is submitted that such a modification is not obvious to those skilled in the art having Walker et al. '896 before them, because of the consistent teaching in Walker et al. that a video clip or the like is consciously selected, not random.

As stated in MPEP Section 2142:

> "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure."

In Walker et al. '896, as the examiner acknowledges, there is no teaching of the random selection of a video clip or the like, as claimed herein.

The examiner does say that Walker et al. '896 does teach a chance machine that are played in the manner dependent upon a random game outcome, but that is a very

different sort of random outcome that has nothing to do with a random selection of one video clip from another. Thus, the absence of the teaching of random video clip selection in Walker et al. '896 is confirmed.

Accordingly, in the examiner's rejection, as indicated by MPEP Section 2142, there is no prior art teaching relative to the random selection of a video clip, for play as a prize in a gaming machine.

As such, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn, and that the presently amended claims are allowable over Walker et al. 6,234,896.

The Examiner is also requested to review British Patent 2,262,642, submitted by IDS on September 3, 2004, and to acknowledge the same by initialing the enclosed reference citation form.

Respectfully submitted,

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP

Garrettson Ellis
Registration No. 22,792
Attorney for Applicant

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
55 East Monroe Street, Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 269-8567

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop: Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on Dec. 9, 2004.

Registered Attorney for Applicant
Date: Dec 9, 2004